Gene Expression Profiling for Skin Cancer

Policy # 00622
Original Effective Date: 08/15/2018
Current Effective Date: 12/11/2023

Applies to all products administered or underwritten by Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana and its subsidiary, HMO Louisiana, Inc. (collectively referred to as the "Company"), unless otherwise provided in the applicable contract. Medical technology is constantly evolving, and we reserve the right to review and update Medical Policy periodically.

Note: Genetic Testing for Familial Cutaneous Malignant Melanoma is addressed separately in medical policy 00206.

Note: Molecular Analysis (Including Liquid Biopsy) for Targeted Therapy or Immunotherapy of Melanoma or Glioma is addressed separately in medical policy 00320.

When Services May be Eligible for Coverage

Coverage for eligible medical treatments or procedures, drugs, devices or biological products may be provided only if:

- *Benefits are available in the member's contract/certificate, and*
- *Medical necessity criteria and guidelines are met.*

Based on review of available data, the Company may consider the use of myPath®‡ Melanoma test in the evaluation of individuals with melanocytic lesions with indeterminate histopathologic and clinical features **to be eligible for coverage.****

Patient Selection Criteria

Coverage eligibility for myPath Melanoma test will be considered when **ALL** of the following criteria are met:

- The lesion is considered a non-metastatic melanocytic lesion; AND
- The test is ordered by dermatopathologist and results will assist when examining diagnostically uncertain or controversial skin biopsy specimen (i.e., clear distinction between benign or malignant neoplasm cannot be achieved using clinical and/or histopathological features alone); AND
- The results of the gene expression testing will be used in conjunction with other diagnostic procedures to determine or alter the treatment plan.

Gene Expression Profiling for Skin Cancer

Policy # 00622
Original Effective Date: 08/15/2018
Current Effective Date: 12/11/2023

Based on review of available data, the Company may consider the use of Pigmented Lesion Assay (PLA) RNA gene expression test on skin samples obtained via adhesive patches **to be eligible for coverage.****

Patient Selection Criteria

Coverage eligibility for PLA test will be considered when **ALL** of the following criteria are met:

- The lesion must meet one or more ABCDE criteria (Asymmetry, Border irregularities, Color variegation, Diameter 6 mm or greater, Evolution)* with a suspicion for melanoma; AND
- Atypical pigmented lesion is melanocytic in origin and between 5 mm and 19 mm; AND
- Results will be used as a decision tool prior to the decision to biopsy; AND
- The PLA test was not used for the same lesion before; AND
- Lesion skin is intact (i.e., non-ulcerated or non-bleeding lesions); AND
- Lesion does not contain a scar or has been previously biopsied; AND
- Lesion is not located in areas of psoriasis, eczema, or similar skin conditions; AND
- Lesion has not already been diagnosed as melanoma or for which the clinical suspicion is sufficiently high that the treating clinician believes melanoma is likely; AND
- Lesion is located in areas other than palms of hands, soles of feet, nails, mucous membranes and hair covered areas that cannot be trimmed.

*ABCDE criteria:

Asymmetry - The shape of one half does not match the other half.
Border is irregular - The edges are often ragged, notched, or blurred in outline. The pigment may spread into the surrounding skin.
Color is uneven - Shades of black, brown, and tan may be present. Areas of white, gray, red, pink, or blue may also be seen.
Diameter - There is a change in size, usually an increase. Melanomas can be tiny, but most are larger than 6 millimeters wide (about 1/4 inch wide).

Based on review of available data, the Company may consider the use of DecisionDx Melanoma to assist in risk stratification of melanoma individuals **to be eligible for coverage.****

Gene Expression Profiling for Skin Cancer

Policy # 00622
Original Effective Date: 08/15/2018
Current Effective Date: 12/11/2023

Patient Selection Criteria
Coverage eligibility for DecisionDx Melanoma will be considered when **ALL** of the following criteria are met:

- The individual has a past medical history of melanoma; AND
- Has either Stage T1b and above OR T1a with documented concern about adequacy of microstaging; AND
- Is undergoing workup or being evaluated for treatment; AND
- Does not have metastatic (stage IV) disease; AND
- Presumed risk for a positive Sentinel Lymph Node Biopsy (SLNB) based on clinical, histological, or other information is > 5%.

When Services Are Considered Investigational

Coverage is not available for investigational medical treatments or procedures, drugs, devices or biological products.

Based on review of available data, the Company considers gene expression testing using PLA and myPath Melanoma tests in all other situations (when patient selection criteria are not met), to be **investigational.***

Based on review of available data, the Company considers gene expression testing using DecisionDx-Melanoma in the evaluation of individuals with cutaneous melanoma for all other indications to be **investigational.***

Based on review of available data, the Company considers TERT gene testing for evaluation of skin lesion or melanoma to be **investigational.***

Based on review of available data, the Company considers other gene expression testing, including but not limited to DecisionDx- SCC and DecisionDx DiffDx-Melanoma in all situations to be **investigational.***

Gene Expression Profiling for Skin Cancer

Policy # 00622
Original Effective Date: 08/15/2018
Current Effective Date: 12/11/2023

Policy Guidelines

Genetic Counseling

Experts recommend formal genetic counseling for individuals who are at risk for inherited disorders and who wish to undergo genetic testing. Interpreting the results of genetic tests and understanding risk factors can be difficult for some individuals; genetic counseling helps individuals understand the impact of genetic testing, including the possible effects the test results could have on the individual or their family members. It should be noted that genetic counseling may alter the utilization of genetic testing substantially and may reduce inappropriate testing; further, genetic counseling should be performed by an individual with experience and expertise in genetic medicine and genetic testing methods.

Melanoma stages:

- Stage 0 or melanoma in situ
- Stage 1
  - 1A- thickness is 1 mm or less, with or without ulceration
  - 1B- greater than 1 mm, but not more than 2 mm thick, without ulceration
- Stage 2
  - 2A- either 1-2 mm thick with ulceration, or 2-4 mm thick without ulceration
  - 2B- 2-4 mm thick with ulceration or more than 4 mm thick without ulceration
  - 2C- more than 4 mm thick with ulceration
- Stage 3 has spread to regional lymph nodes
- Stage 4 has spread to other organs and/or distant lymph nodes

Background/Overview

Cutaneous Melanoma

Cutaneous melanoma accounts for more than 90% of cases of melanoma. For many decades, melanoma incidence was rapidly increasing in the U.S. However, recent estimates have suggested the rise may be slowing. In 2018, more than 90000 new cases of melanoma are expected to be diagnosed, and more than 9,000 people are expected to die of melanoma.

Risk Factors
Exposure to solar ultraviolet radiation is a major risk factor for melanoma. Most melanomas occur on the sun-exposed skin, particularly those areas most susceptible to sunburn. Likewise, features that are associated with an individual's sensitivity to sunlight, such as light skin pigmentation, red or blond hair, blue or green eyes, freckling tendency, and poor tanning ability are well-known risk factors for melanoma. There is also a strong association between high total body nevus counts and melanoma.

Several genes appear to contribute to melanoma predisposition such as tumor suppressor gene *CDKN2A,* melanocortin-1 receptor (*MC1R*) gene, and *BAP1* variants. Individuals with either familial or sporadic melanoma have a two to three times increased risk of developing a subsequent primary melanoma. Several occupational exposures and lifestyle factors, such as body mass index and smoking, have been evaluated as possible risk factors for melanoma.

Gene Expression Profiling
Gene expression profiling (GEP) measures the activity of thousands of genes simultaneously and creates a snapshot of cellular function. Data for GEP are generated by several molecular technologies including DNA microarrays that measures activity relative to previously identified genes and RNA-Seq that directly sequences and quantifies RNA molecules. Clinical applications of GEP include disease diagnosis, disease classification, prediction of drug response, and prognosis.

Squamous Cell Carcinoma
According to the National Cancer Institute, individuals with chronic sun damage, history of sunburns, arsenic exposure, chronic cutaneous inflammation, and previous radiation therapy are predisposed to the development of squamous cell carcinoma (SCC).

The DecisionDx-SCC test (Castle Biosciences Inc., Friendswood, TX) is commercially marketed to predict metastatic risk for individuals with SCC and one or more risk factors. It classifies the individual as low (Class 1), moderate (Class 2A) or high (Class 2B) biological risk of metastasis.

FDA or Other Governmental Regulatory Approval

U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA)

Clinical laboratories may develop and validate tests in-house and market them as a laboratory service; laboratory-developed tests must meet the general regulatory standards of the Clinical Laboratory Improvement Amendments. The Pigmented Lesion Assay, myPath Melanoma, and DecisionDx-Melanoma tests are available under the auspices of the Clinical Laboratory Improvement Amendments. Laboratories that offer laboratory-developed tests must be licensed by the Clinical Laboratory Improvement Amendments for high-complexity testing. To date, the U.S. FDA has chosen not to require any regulatory review of this test.

Rationale/Source

This medical policy was developed through consideration of peer-reviewed medical literature generally recognized by the relevant medical community, U.S. Food and Drug Administration approval status, nationally accepted standards of medical practice and accepted standards of medical practice in this community, technology evaluation centers, reference to federal regulations, other plan medical policies, and accredited national guidelines.

Laboratory tests have been developed that detect the expression of different genes in pigmented lesions or melanoma tumor tissue. Test results may help providers and individuals decide whether to biopsy suspicious pigmented lesions, aid in diagnosis lesions with indeterminate histopathologic lesions or determine whether to perform sentinel lymph node biopsy in individuals diagnosed with stage I or II cutaneous melanoma. This report summarizes the evidence of 3 tests.

Summary of Evidence

For individuals with suspicious pigmented lesions (based on ABCDE and/or ugly duckling criteria) being considered for biopsy who receive GEP with the DermTech Pigmented Lesion Assay and TERT gene testing to determine which lesions should proceed to biopsy, the evidence includes observational studies. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, disease-specific survival, validity, and resource utilization. The Pigmented Lesion Assay has 1 clinical validity study with many methodologic and reporting limitations. Therefore, performance characteristics are not well-characterized. Also, the test has not been compared with dermoscopy, another tool frequently used to make biopsy decisions. No direct evidence of clinical utility was identified. Given that the evidence is insufficient to demonstrate test performance, no inferences can be made about clinical

utility through a chain of evidence. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals who have melanocytic lesions with indeterminate histopathologic features who receive GEP with the myPath Melanoma test added to histopathology to aid in the diagnosis of melanoma, the evidence includes observational studies. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, disease-specific survival, test validity, change in disease status, treatment-related morbidity. The myPath test has 1 clinical validity study, which includes long-term follow-up for metastasis as the reference standard. However, it is not clear if the study population included lesions that were indeterminate following histopathology and the study had other methodologic and reporting limitations. Therefore, performance characteristics are not well-characterized. No direct evidence of clinical utility was identified. Given that the evidence is insufficient to demonstrate test performance, no inferences can be made about clinical utility through a chain of evidence. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals with American Joint Committee on Cancer (AJCC) stage I to III cutaneous melanoma who receive GEP with the DecisionDx-Melanoma test to inform management decisions regarding surveillance, the evidence includes retrospective and prospective observational studies. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, disease-specific survival, test validity, change in disease status, resource utilization and treatment-related morbidity. The DecisionDx-Melanoma test has 3 independent clinical validity studies that have reported 5-year recurrence-free survival (RFS) in AJCC stage I or II individuals. Gerami et al (2015) reported RFS rates of 37% for DecisionDx class 2 (high-risk) in individuals in AJCC stage I and II individuals combined. Zager et al (2018) reported RFS rates of 85% (95% confidence interval [CI], 74% to 97%) for DecisionDx class 2 individuals in AJCC stage 1 and 55% (95% CI, 44% to 69%) for DecisionDx class 2 in AJCC stage II disease. RFS does not appear to be well-characterized as evidenced by the variation in estimates across studies. This indication is to 'rule-in' individuals for enhanced surveillance; therefore, specificity and positive predictive value (PPV) are key performance characteristics. Zager et al (2018) and Greenhaw et al (2018) the specificities were 71% and 87% respectively while the PPV were 48% and 24%, respectively. The PPV suggests that the majority of individuals identified as high-risk by the DecisionDx test would not develop metastasis and would be unnecessarily subjected to additional surveillance. Greenhaw et al (2018) also reported that in 219 AJCC stage I individuals, 201 had DecisionDx class 1 (low-risk) scores and 18 had DecisionDx class 2 (high-risk) scores. The only metastasis in stage I individuals occurred in a individual with a DecisionDx class 1 score. Therefore

none of their stage 1 individuals benefited from DecisionDx testing but 18 (8%) were incorrectly identified as high-risk for metastasis and could have received unnecessary surveillance. Five-year RFS data are not available for the subgroup of individuals for whom a 'rule-out' test would be relevant (class IIB through III). There is no evidence that changes to the frequency and methods for surveillance improve outcomes. Given that the evidence is insufficient to demonstrate test performance and there is no evidence that changes in surveillance improve outcomes, no inferences can be made about clinical utility through a chain of evidence. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals with AJCC stage I or II cutaneous melanoma who receive GEP with the DecisionDx-Melanoma test to inform management decisions regarding adjuvant therapy, the evidence includes retrospective and prospective observational studies. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, disease-specific survival, test validity, change in disease status, resource utilization and treatment-related morbidity. The DecisionDx-Melanoma test has 3 independent clinical validity studies that have reported 5-year RFS in AJCC stage I or II individuals. Gerami et al (2015) reported RFS rates of 37% for DecisionDx class 2 (high-risk) in individuals in AJCC stage I and II individuals combined. Zager et al (2018) reported RFS rates of 85% (95% CI, 74% to 97%) for DecisionDx class 2 individuals in AJCC stage 1 and 55% (95% CI, 44% to 69%) for DecisionDx class 2 in AJCC stage II disease. RFS does not appear to be well-characterized as evidenced by the variation in estimates across studies. This indication is to 'rule-in' individuals for adjuvant therapy; therefore, specificity and PPV are key performance characteristics. Zager et al (2018) and Greenhaw et al (2018) the specificities were 71% and 87% respectively while the PPV were 48% and 24%, respectively. The PPV suggests that the majority of individuals identified as high-risk by the DecisionDx test would not develop metastasis and would be unnecessarily subjected to additional treatment. Greenhaw et al (2018) also reported that in 219 AJCC stage I individuals, 201 had DecisionDx class 1 (low-risk) scores and 18 had DecisionDx class 2 (high-risk) scores. The only metastasis in stage I individuals occurred in a individual with a DecisionDx class 1 score. Therefore none of their stage 1 individuals benefited from DecisionDx testing but 18 (8%) were incorrectly identified as high-risk for metastasis and could have received unnecessary treatment. There is no evidence that adjuvant therapy improves outcomes in these individuals. Given that the evidence is insufficient to demonstrate test performance and there is no evidence that adjuvant therapy improves outcomes, no inferences can be made about clinical utility through a chain of evidence. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals with stage I or II cutaneous melanoma with clinically negative sentinel node basins who are being considered for sentinel lymph node (SLN) biopsy who receive GEP with the DecisionDx-Melanoma test to determine whether to perform SLN biopsy, the evidence includes retrospective observational studies. Relevant outcomes are overall survival, disease-specific survival, test validity, change in disease status, resource utilization and treatment-related morbidity. The DecisionDx-Melanoma test has 3 independent clinical validity studies that have reported 5-year RFS in AJCC stage I or II individuals. Gerami et al (2015) reported RFS rates of 98% in DecisionDx class 1 (low-risk) without CIs, in AJCC stage I or II individuals. Zager et al (2017) reported RFS rates of 96% (95% CI, 94% to 99%) for DecisionDx class 1 in individuals with AJCC stage I disease; they also reported RFS rates of 74% (95% CI, 60% to 91%) for DecisionDx class 1 in individuals with AJCC stage II disease. Although CIs were not available for the first study, RFS does not appear to be well-characterized as evidenced by the variation in estimates across studies. Zager et al (2017) also reported that in 56 individuals who were DecisionDx class 1 (low-risk) but SLN biopsy-positive, 22 recurrences (39%) occurred over 5 years. If the DecisionDx test were used as a triage for SLN biopsy, these individuals would not undergo SLN biopsy and would likely not receive adjuvant therapy, which has shown to be effective at prolonging time to recurrence in node-positive individuals. Data on 5-year RFS is not available for the target population (Class 1A individuals ≤55 years old who have tumors less than 2 mm deep [T1 to T2]) outside of the retrospective cohort that was used to identify the target population. No direct evidence of clinical utility was identified. Given that the evidence is insufficient to demonstrate test performance, no inferences can be made about clinical utility through a chain of evidence. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

For individuals with head and neck cutaneous squamous cell carcinoma (SCC) who receive DecisionDx-SCC test the evidence includes a 2022 manufacturer-sponsored study by Arron and colleagues. This multicenter, retrospective cohort study obtained formalin-fixed paraffin-embedded archival tissue from the primary tumor and associated clinicopathologic data from individuals with cutaneous squamous cell carcinoma of the head and neck (n=278). A majority of the individuals were male (82.4%) and Caucasian (99.6%) and the median age was 71 years. The study noted 61.5% (n=71) of the cases were high and 38.5% (n=107) were very high based on NCCN risk status guideline definition. Of the cases having metastasis, 38.9% (n=21) were high risk and 61.1% (n=33) were very high risk and event rates of 12.3% and 30.8%, respectively ($p<0.001$). The 40-GEP test noted 45.3% of the cases as Class 1 (low risk, n=126), 48.2% as Class 2 (moderate risk, n=134) and 6.5% as Class 2B (high risk, n=18). Of the cases having metastasis, 20.4% (n=11) were low risk,

61.1% (n=33) were moderate risk and 18.5% (n=10) were high risk. Long term studies may be necessary to further evaluate impact on health outcomes. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

The DecisionDx DiffDx-Melanoma test is a novel, proprietary, empirically-derived, multi-analyte algorithmic gene expression assay (MAAA) validated as an adjunctive diagnostic tool for individuals with primary cutaneous melanocytic neoplasms of uncertain/equivocal malignant potential with equivocal histopathology. The DecisionDx DiffDx-Melanoma test measures the gene expression profile of 35 genes (32 discriminant and 3 control genes) by qRT-PCR from the primary melanocytic biopsy (on formalin-fixed paraffin-embedded tumor tissue biopsy specimen) to identify melanocytic lesions with unknown malignant potential as benign, intermediate-risk, or malignant. Nine melanoma and eight benign nevi subtypes were included in the validation study, including in situ lesions, which have not previously been validated in a MAAA test. The test demonstrated 99.1% sensitivity, 94.3% specificity, 93.6% positive predictive value and 99.2% negative predictive value. 96.4% of cases received a differential result and 3.6% had intermediate-risk. Limitations include a lack of evidence demonstrating clinical utility. The evidence is insufficient to determine that the technology results in an improvement in the net health outcome.

Supplemental Information

The purpose of the following information is to provide reference material. Inclusion does not imply endorsement or alignment with the evidence review conclusions.

Practice Guidelines and Position Statements

Guidelines or position statements will be considered for inclusion in ‘Supplemental Information' if they were issued by, or jointly by, a US professional society, an international society with US representation, or National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). Priority will be given to guidelines that are informed by a systematic review, include strength of evidence ratings, and include a description of management of conflict of interest.

National Comprehensive Cancer Network

The National Comprehensive Cancer Network guidelines (v.3.2023) for melanoma made the following statements on use of gene expression profiling.

Gene Expression Profiling for Skin Cancer

Policy # 00622
Original Effective Date: 08/15/2018
Current Effective Date: 12/11/2023

The guidelines state the following regarding diagnostic testing for indeterminate melanocytic neoplasms following histopathology: "Melanocytic neoplasms of uncertain biologic potential present a unique challenge to pathologists and treating clinicians. Ancillary methods to aid in benign versus malignant differentiation include molecular cytogenetics (eg, comparative genomic hybridization [CGH]), fluorescence in situ hybridization [FISH]), GEP, next generation sequencing (NGS), and immunohistochemistry (IHC), among others. While limited report on the intermediate category of melanocytic neoplasia show evolutionary pathogenic genetic alteration during melanoma progression, there are insufficient data from histologically ambiguous melanocytic neoplasms."

The guidelines state the following regarding prognostic testing:

- 'The use of GEP testing according to specific AJCC-8 melanoma stage (before or after sentinel lymph node biopsy [SLNB]) requires further prospective investigation in large, contemporary data sets of unselected individuals. Prognostic GEP testing to differentiate melanomas at low versus high risk for metastasis should not replace pathologic staging procedures. Moreover, since there is a low probability of metastasis in stage I melanoma and a higher proportion of false-positive results, GEP testing should not guide clinical decision-making in this subgroup."
- "Commercially available GEP tests are marketed as being able to classify cutaneous melanoma into separate categories based on risk of metastasis. However it remains unclear whether these tests provide clinically actionable prognostic information when used in addition to or in comparison with known clinicopathologic factors or multivariable nomograms that incorporate individual sex, age, tumor location and thickness, …. Furthermore, the impact of these tests on treatment outcomes or follow-up schedules has not been established.'
- 'Various (mostly retrospective) studies of prognostic GEP testing suggest its role as an independent predictor of worse outcomes, though not superior to Breslow thickness or SLN status. It remains unclear whether available GEP platforms are reliably predictive of outcome across the risk spectrum of melanoma. Prospective validation studies (as have been performed in breast cancer) are required to more accurately define the clinical utility of molecular testing prior to widespread implementation of GEP for prognostication of cutaneous melanoma and in particular to determine its role in guiding surveillance imaging, SLNB, and adjuvant treatment decisions.'

American Academy of Dermatology
In 2019, the American Academy of Dermatology published guidelines of care for the management of primary cutaneous melanoma. The guidelines state the following regarding GEP tests:

- Regarding diagnostic GEP tests:
  - "Diagnostic molecular techniques are still largely investigative and may be appropriate as ancillary tests in equivocal melanocytic neoplasms, but they are not recommended for routine diagnostic use in CM [cutaneous melanoma]. These include comparative genomic hybridization, fluorescence in situ hybridization, GEP, and (potentially) next-generation sequencing."
  - "Ancillary diagnostic molecular techniques (eg, CGH, FISH, GEP) may be used for equivocal melanocytic neoplasms."
- Regarding prognostic GEP tests:
  - "...there is also insufficient evidence of benefit to recommend routine use of currently available prognostic molecular tests, including GEP, to provide more accurate prognosis beyond currently known clinicopathologic factors" (Strength of evidence: C, Level of evidence II/III)
  - "Going forward, GEP assays should be tested against all known histopathologic prognostic factors and contemporary eighth edition of AJCC CM staging to assess their additive value in prognostication."
  - "Routine molecular testing, including GEP, for prognostication is discouraged until better use criteria are defined. The application of molecular information for clinical management (eg, sentinel lymph node eligibility, follow-up, and/or therapeutic choice) is not recommended outside of a clinical study or trial."

In 2019, the American Academy of Dermatology updated their Choosing Wisely recommendation that physicians not perform SLN biopsy or other diagnostic tests for the evaluation of early, thin melanoma because they do not improve survival. The Academy noted that early, thin melanoma (melanoma in situ, T1a melanoma or T1b melanoma $\leq$ 0.5 mm) has a very low risk of the cancer spreading to the lymph nodes or other parts of the body and a 97% 5-year survival rate.

National Society for Cutaneous Medicine
In 2019, the National Society for Cutaneous Medicine published appropriate use criteria for the integration of diagnostic and prognostic gene expression profile assays for management of cutaneous melanoma. The criteria were developed with "unrestricted educational grants from related

companies involved with these technologies". The majority of the panel members were consultants or advisors for Castle BioSciences or Myriad. The criteria were consensus-based using a modified Delphi approach. Numerous recommendations were made for each of the tests reviewed here. Some of the recommendations are as follows:

- Using Pigmented Lesion Assay test for individuals with atypical lesions requiring assessment beyond visual inspection to help in selection for biopsy (B = Inconsistent or limited quality individual-oriented evidence)
- Using myPath for differentiation of a nevus from melanoma in an adult individual when the morphologic findings are ambiguous by light microscopic parameters (A = Consistent, good-quality individual-oriented evidence)
- Using DecisionDx by integrating results into the decision to adjust follow up regimens or to assess need for imaging (B = Inconsistent or limited quality individual-oriented evidence)
- Using DecisionDx by integrating results into subsequent management of individuals:
  - Who are sentinel node negative (A = Consistent, good-quality individual-oriented evidence)
  - Who are in AJCC “low risk” categories: (Thin (<1mm), Stage I-IIA, SLNBx-) (B= Inconsistent or limited quality individual-oriented evidence)
- Using DecisionDx by integrating 31-GEP results as a criteria for inclusion in a chemotherapy regimen (C = Consensus, disease-oriented evidence, usual practice, expert opinion, or case series)

U.S. Preventive Services Task Force Recommendations
Not applicable.

Medicare National Coverage
There is no national coverage determination. In the absence of a national coverage determination, coverage decisions are left to the discretion of local Medicare carriers.

Ongoing and Unpublished Clinical Trials
A search of ClinicalTrials.gov in April 2022 did not identify any ongoing or unpublished trials that would likely influence this review.

References

1. Chang AE, Karnell LH, Menck HR. The National Cancer Data Base report on cutaneous and noncutaneous melanoma: a summary of 84,836 cases from the past decade. The American College of Surgeons Commission on Cancer and the American Cancer Society. Cancer. Oct 15 1998; 83(8): 1664-78. PMID 9781962
2. Siegel RL, Miller KD, Jemal A. Cancer statistics, 2018. CA Cancer J Clin. Jan 2018; 68(1): 7-30. PMID 29313949
3. Gilchrest BA, Eller MS, Geller AC, et al. The pathogenesis of melanoma induced by ultraviolet radiation. N Engl J Med. Apr 29 1999; 340(17): 1341-8. PMID 10219070
4. Gandini S, Sera F, Cattaruzza MS, et al. Meta-analysis of risk factors for cutaneous melanoma: III. Family history, actinic damage and phenotypic factors. Eur J Cancer. Sep 2005; 41(14): 2040-59. PMID 16125929
5. Caini S, Gandini S, Sera F, et al. Meta-analysis of risk factors for cutaneous melanoma according to anatomical site and clinico-pathological variant. Eur J Cancer. Nov 2009; 45(17): 3054-63. PMID 19545997
6. Goldstein AM, Chan M, Harland M, et al. Features associated with germline CDKN2A mutations: a GenoMEL study of melanoma-prone families from three continents. J Med Genet. Feb 2007; 44(2): 99-106. PMID 16905682
7. Wendt J, Rauscher S, Burgstaller-Muehlbacher S, et al. Human Determinants and the Role of Melanocortin-1 Receptor Variants in Melanoma Risk Independent of UV Radiation Exposure. JAMA Dermatol. Jul 01 2016; 152(7): 776-82. PMID 27050141
8. Wiesner T, Obenauf AC, Murali R, et al. Germline mutations in BAP1 predispose to melanocytic tumors. Nat Genet. Aug 28 2011; 43(10): 1018-21. PMID 21874003
9. Chen T, Fallah M, Forsti A, et al. Risk of Next Melanoma in Patients With Familial and Sporadic Melanoma by Number of Previous Melanomas. JAMA Dermatol. Jun 2015; 151(6): 607-15. PMID 25671687
10. Jiang AJ, Rambhatla PV, Eide MJ. Socioeconomic and lifestyle factors and melanoma: a systematic review. Br J Dermatol. Apr 2015; 172(4): 885-915. PMID 25354495
11. Abbasi NR, Shaw HM, Rigel DS, et al. Early diagnosis of cutaneous melanoma: revisiting the ABCD criteria. JAMA. Dec 08 2004; 292(22): 2771-6. PMID 15585738
12. Grob JJ, Bonerandi JJ. The 'ugly duckling' sign: identification of the common characteristics of nevi in an individual as a basis for melanoma screening. Arch Dermatol. Jan 1998; 134(1): 103-4. PMID 9449921

13. Wilson RL, Yentzer BA, Isom SP, et al. How good are US dermatologists at discriminating skin cancers? A number-needed-to-treat analysis. J Dermatolog Treat. Feb 2012; 23(1): 65-9. PMID 21756146
14. National Center for Biotechnology Information. PRAME preferentially expressed antigen in melanoma. 2021; https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/gene/23532.
15. DermTech. Pigmented Lesion Assay: Non-invasive gene expression analysis of pigmented skin lesions. Performance and Development Notes. 2015; http://dermtech.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/White-Paper- DermTech-Melanoma-Assay-.pdf. Wachsman W, Morhenn V, Palmer T, et al. Noninvasive genomic detection of melanoma. Br J Dermatol. Apr 2011; 164(4): 797-806. PMID 21294715
16. Gerami P, Alsobrook JP, Palmer TJ, et al. Development of a novel noninvasive adhesive patch test for the evaluation of pigmented lesions of the skin. J Am Acad Dermatol. Aug 2014; 71(2): 237-44. PMID 24906614
17. Gerami P, Yao Z, Polsky D, et al. Development and validation of a noninvasive 2-gene molecular assay for cutaneous melanoma. J Am Acad Dermatol. Jan 2017; 76(1): 114-120.e2. PMID 27707590
18. Vestergaard ME, Macaskill P, Holt PE, et al. Dermoscopy compared with naked eye examination for the diagnosis of primary melanoma: a meta-analysis of studies performed in a clinical setting. Br J Dermatol. Sep 2008; 159(3): 669-76. PMID 18616769
19. Murzaku EC, Hayan S, Rao BK. Methods and rates of dermoscopy usage: a cross-sectional survey of US dermatologists stratified by years in practice. J Am Acad Dermatol. Aug 2014; 71(2): 393-5. PMID 25037790
20. Engasser HC, Warshaw EM. Dermatoscopy use by US dermatologists: a cross-sectional survey. J Am Acad Dermatol. Sep 2010; 63(3): 412-9, 419.e1-2. PMID 20619490
21. Bossuyt PM, Irwig L, Craig J, et al. Comparative accuracy: assessing new tests against existing diagnostic pathways. BMJ. May 06 2006; 332(7549): 1089-92. PMID 16675820
22. Ferris LK, Gerami P, Skelsey MK, et al. Real-world performance and utility of a noninvasive gene expression assay to evaluate melanoma risk in pigmented lesions. Melanoma Res. Oct 2018; 28(5): 478-482. PMID 30004988
23. Ferris LK, Jansen B, Ho J, et al. Utility of a Noninvasive 2-Gene Molecular Assay for Cutaneous Melanoma and Effect on the Decision to Biopsy. JAMA Dermatol. Jul 01 2017; 153(7): 675-680. PMID 28445578
24. Myriad. n.d. Understanding the myPath Melanoma Results; https://mypathmelanoma.com/about-mypath- melanoma/understanding-the-mypath-melanoma-

results/. Clarke LE, Warf MB, Flake DD, et al. Clinical validation of a gene expression signature that differentiates benign nevi from malignant melanoma. J Cutan Pathol. Apr 2015; 42(4): 244-52. PMID 25727210
25. Clarke LE, Flake DD, Busam K, et al. An independent validation of a gene expression signature to differentiate malignant melanoma from benign melanocytic nevi. Cancer. Feb 15 2017; 123(4): 617-628. PMID 27768230
26. Reimann JDR, Salim S, Velazquez EF, et al. Comparison of melanoma gene expression score with histopathology, fluorescence in situ hybridization, and SNP array for the classification of melanocytic neoplasms. Mod Pathol. Nov 2018; 31(11): 1733-1743. PMID 29955141
27. Gaiser T, Kutzner H, Palmedo G, et al. Classifying ambiguous melanocytic lesions with FISH and correlation with clinical long-term follow up. Mod Pathol. Mar 2010; 23(3): 413-9. PMID 20081813
28. Vergier B, Prochazkova-Carlotti M, de la Fouchardiere A, et al. Fluorescence in situ hybridization, a diagnostic aid in ambiguous melanocytic tumors: European study of 113 cases. Mod Pathol. May 2011; 24(5): 613-23. PMID 21151100
29. Ko JS, Clarke LE, Minca EC, et al. Correlation of melanoma gene expression score with clinical outcomes on a series of melanocytic lesions. Hum Pathol. Apr 2019; 86: 213-221. PMID 30566894
30. Clarke LE, Pimentel JD, Zalaznick H, et al. Gene expression signature as an ancillary method in the diagnosis of desmoplastic melanoma. Hum Pathol. Dec 2017; 70: 113-120. PMID 29079183
31. Minca EC, Al-Rohil RN, Wang M, et al. Comparison between melanoma gene expression score and fluorescence in situ hybridization for the classification of melanocytic lesions. Mod Pathol. Aug 2016; 29(8): 832-43. PMID 27174586
32. Ko JS, Matharoo-Ball B, Billings SD, et al. Diagnostic Distinction of Malignant Melanoma and Benign Nevi by a Gene Expression Signature and Correlation to Clinical Outcomes. Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev. Jul 2017; 26(7): 1107-1113. PMID 28377414
33. Clarke LE, Mabey B, Flake Ii DD, et al. Clinical validity of a gene expression signature in diagnostically uncertain neoplasms. Per Med. Sep 2020; 17(5): 361-371. PMID 32915688
34. Cockerell C, Tschen J, Billings SD, et al. The influence of a gene-expression signature on the treatment of diagnostically challenging melanocytic lesions. Per Med. Mar 2017; 14(2): 123-130. PMID 28757886
35. Cockerell CJ, Tschen J, Evans B, et al. The influence of a gene expression signature on the diagnosis and recommended treatment of melanocytic tumors by dermatopathologists. Medicine (Baltimore). Oct 2016; 95(40): e4887. PMID 27749545

36. Gershenwald JES, R.A.; Hess, K.R.; et al. Melanoma of the Skin. Chicago, IL: American Joint Committee on Cancer; 2017.
37. Eggermont AM, Chiarion-Sileni V, Grob JJ, et al. Prolonged Survival in Stage III Melanoma with Ipilimumab Adjuvant Therapy. N Engl J Med. Nov 10 2016; 375(19): 1845-1855. PMID 27717298
38. Weber J, Mandala M, Del Vecchio M, et al. Adjuvant Nivolumab versus Ipilimumab in Resected Stage III or IV Melanoma. N Engl J Med. Nov 09 2017; 377(19): 1824-1835. PMID 28891423
39. Long GV, Hauschild A, Santinami M, et al. Adjuvant Dabrafenib plus Trametinib in Stage III BRAF-Mutated Melanoma. N Engl J Med. Nov 09 2017; 377(19): 1813-1823. PMID 28891408
40. Gerami P, Cook RW, Wilkinson J, et al. Development of a prognostic genetic signature to predict the metastatic risk associated with cutaneous melanoma. Clin Cancer Res. Jan 01 2015; 21(1): 175-83. PMID 25564571
41. Zager JS, Gastman BR, Leachman S, et al. Performance of a prognostic 31-gene expression profile in an independent cohort of 523 cutaneous melanoma patients. BMC Cancer. Feb 05 2018; 18(1): 130. PMID 29402264
42. Wrightson WR, Wong SL, Edwards MJ, et al. Complications associated with sentinel lymph node biopsy for melanoma. Ann Surg Oncol. Jul 2003; 10(6): 676-80. PMID 12839853
43. Soong SJ, Ding S, Coit DG, et al. AJCC: Individualized melanoma patient outcome prediction tools. n.d.; http://www.melanomaprognosis.net/.
44. Callender GG, Gershenwald JE, Egger ME, et al. A novel and accurate computer model of melanoma prognosis for patients staged by sentinel lymph node biopsy: comparison with the American Joint Committee on Cancer model. J Am Coll Surg. Apr 2012; 214(4): 608-17; discussion 617-9. PMID 22342785
45. Dicker TJ, Kavanagh GM, Herd RM, et al. A rational approach to melanoma follow-up in patients with primary cutaneous melanoma. Scottish Melanoma Group. Br J Dermatol. Feb 1999; 140(2): 249-54. PMID 10233217
46. Garbe C, Paul A, Kohler-Spath H, et al. Prospective evaluation of a follow-up schedule in cutaneous melanoma patients: recommendations for an effective follow-up strategy. J Clin Oncol. Feb 01 2003; 21(3): 520-9. PMID 12560444
47. Faries MB, Steen S, Ye X, et al. Late recurrence in melanoma: clinical implications of lost dormancy. J Am Coll Surg. Jul 2013; 217(1): 27-34; discussion 34-6. PMID 23643694
48. Hsueh EC, DeBloom JR, Lee J, et al. Interim analysis of survival in a prospective, multi-center registry cohort of cutaneous melanoma tested with a prognostic 31-gene expression profile test. J Hematol Oncol. Aug 29 2017; 10(1): 152. PMID 28851416

49. Podlipnik S, Carrera C, Boada A, et al. Early outcome of a 31-gene expression profile test in 86 AJCC stage IB-II melanoma patients. A prospective multicentre cohort study. J Eur Acad Dermatol Venereol. May 2019; 33(5): 857-862. PMID 30702163
50. Hsueh EC, DeBloom JR, Lee JH, et al. Long-Term Outcomes in a Multicenter, Prospective Cohort Evaluating the Prognostic 31-Gene Expression Profile for Cutaneous Melanoma. JCO Precis Oncol. 2021; 5. PMID 34036233
51. Gastman BR, Gerami P, Kurley SJ, et al. Identification of patients at risk of metastasis using a prognostic 31-gene expression profile in subpopulations of melanoma patients with favorable outcomes by standard criteria. J Am Acad Dermatol. Jan 2019; 80(1): 149-157.e4. PMID 30081113
52. Gastman BR, Zager JS, Messina JL, et al. Performance of a 31-gene expression profile test in cutaneous melanomas of the head and neck. Head Neck. Apr 2019; 41(4): 871-879. PMID 30694001
53. Vetto JT, Hsueh EC, Gastman BR, et al. Guidance of sentinel lymph node biopsy decisions in patients with T1-T2 melanoma using gene expression profiling. Future Oncol. Apr 2019; 15(11): 1207-1217. PMID 30691297
54. Marks, Etan et al. Establishing an evidence-based decision point for clinical use of the 31-gene expression profile test in cutaneous melanoma. SKIN The Journal of Cutaneous Medicine, [S.l.], July 2019, v. 3, n. 4, p. 239-249.
55. Greenhaw BN, Zitelli JA, Brodland DG. Estimation of Prognosis in Invasive Cutaneous Melanoma: An Independent Study of the Accuracy of a Gene Expression Profile Test. Dermatol Surg. Dec 2018; 44(12): 1494-1500. PMID 29994951
56. Keller J, Schwartz TL, Lizalek JM, et al. Prospective validation of the prognostic 31-gene expression profiling test in primary cutaneous melanoma. Cancer Med. May 2019; 8(5): 2205-2212. PMID 30950242
57. Gerami P, Cook RW, Russell MC, et al. Gene expression profiling for molecular staging of cutaneous melanoma in patients undergoing sentinel lymph node biopsy. J Am Acad Dermatol. May 2015; 72(5): 780-5.e3. PMID 25748297
58. Ferris LK, Farberg AS, Middlebrook B, et al. Identification of high-risk cutaneous melanoma tumors is improved when combining the online American Joint Committee on Cancer Individualized Melanoma Patient Outcome Prediction Tool with a 31-gene expression profile-based classification. J Am Acad Dermatol. May 2017; 76(5): 818-825.e3. PMID 28110997

59. Berger AC, Davidson RS, Poitras JK, et al. Clinical impact of a 31-gene expression profile test for cutaneous melanoma in 156 prospectively and consecutively tested patients. Curr Med Res Opin. Sep 2016; 32(9): 1599-604. PMID 27210115
60. Farberg AS, Glazer AM, White R, et al. Impact of a 31-gene Expression Profiling Test for Cutaneous Melanoma on Dermatologists' Clinical Management Decisions. J Drugs Dermatol. May 01 2017; 16(5): 428-431. PMID 28628677
61. Schuitevoerder D, Heath M, Cook RW, et al. Impact of Gene Expression Profiling on Decision-Making in Clinically Node Negative Melanoma Patients after Surgical Staging. J Drugs Dermatol. Feb 01 2018; 17(2): 196-199. PMID 29462228
62. Dillon LD, Gadzia JE, Davidson RS, et al. Prospective, multicenter clinical impact evaluation of a 31-gene expression profile test for management of melanoma patients. Skin. 2018;2(2):111-121.
63. Hyams DM, Covington KR, Johnson CE, et al. Integrating the melanoma 31-gene expression profile test with surgical oncology practice within national guideline and staging recommendations. Future Oncol. Feb 2021; 17(5): 517-527. PMID 33021104
64. Dillon LD, McPhee M, Davidson RS, et al. Expanded evidence that the 31-gene expression profile test provides clinical utility for melanoma management in a multicenter study. Curr Med Res Opin. Feb 15 2022: 1-8. PMID 35081854
65. National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN) Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology. Cutaneous Melanoma. Version 32.2023. https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/cutaneous_melanoma.pdf.
66. Swetter SM, Tsao H, Bichakjian CK, et al. Guidelines of care for the management of primary cutaneous melanoma. J Am Acad Dermatol. Jan 2019; 80(1): 208-250. PMID 30392755
67. American Academy of Dermatology. Choosing Wisely. 2019. https://www.choosingwisely.org/clinician-lists/american-academy-dermatology-sentinal-lymph-node-biopsy-early-melanoma-evaluation/.
68. LCD - MolDX: myPath® Melanoma Assay (L37859) (cms.gov)

Policy History

Original Effective Date: 08/15/2018
Current Effective Date: 12/11/2023
08/09/2018 Medical Policy Committee review
08/15/2018 Medical Policy Implementation Committee approval. New policy.

Gene Expression Profiling for Skin Cancer

Policy # 00622
Original Effective Date: 08/15/2018
Current Effective Date: 12/11/2023

08/01/2019	Medical Policy Committee review
08/14/2019	Medical Policy Implementation Committee approval. No change to coverage.
08/06/2020	Medical Policy Committee review
08/12/2020	Medical Policy Implementation Committee approval. No change to coverage.
12/11/2020	Coding update
08/05/2021	Medical Policy Committee review
08/11/2021	Medical Policy Implementation Committee approval. No change to coverage.
04/28/2022	Coding update
08/04/2022	Medical Policy Committee review
08/10/2022	Medical Policy Implementation Committee approval. No change to coverage.
10/11/2022	Coding update
09/01/2022	Medical Policy Committee review
09/14/2022	Medical Policy Implementation Committee approval. Coverage changed from investigational to eligible for coverage with criteria for Senate bill review.
06/01/2023	Medical Policy Committee review
06/14/2023	Medical Policy Implementation Committee approval. Added "Based on review of available data, the Company considers TERT gene testing for evaluation of skin lesion or melanoma to be investigational." Title changed to Gene Expression Profiling for Skin Cancer. Added "Based on review of available data, the Company considers other gene expression testing, including but not limited to using DecisionDx- SCC and DecisionDx DiffDx-Melanoma in all situations to be investigational" as investigational.
11/02/2023	Medical Policy Committee review
11/08/2023	Medical Policy Implementation Committee approval. The individual has a personal history was changed to a past medical history of melanoma in the criteria for DecisionDx Melanoma.

Next Scheduled Review Date: 11/2024

Coding

The five character codes included in the Blue Cross Blue Shield of Louisiana Medical Policy Coverage Guidelines are obtained from Current Procedural Terminology (CPT®)‡, copyright 2022 by the American Medical Association (AMA). CPT is developed by the AMA as a listing of

Gene Expression Profiling for Skin Cancer

Policy # 00622
Original Effective Date: 08/15/2018
Current Effective Date: 12/11/2023

descriptive terms and five character identifying codes and modifiers for reporting medical services and procedures performed by physician.

The responsibility for the content of Blue Cross Blue Shield of Louisiana Medical Policy Coverage Guidelines is with Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana and no endorsement by the AMA is intended or should be implied. The AMA disclaims responsibility for any consequences or liability attributable or related to any use, nonuse or interpretation of information contained in Blue Cross Blue Shield of Louisiana Medical Policy Coverage Guidelines. Fee schedules, relative value units, conversion factors and/or related components are not assigned by the AMA, are not part of CPT, and the AMA is not recommending their use. The AMA does not directly or indirectly practice medicine or dispense medical services. The AMA assumes no liability for data contained or not contained herein. Any use of CPT outside of Blue Cross Blue Shield of Louisiana Medical Policy Coverage Guidelines should refer to the most current Current Procedural Terminology which contains the complete and most current listing of CPT codes and descriptive terms. Applicable FARS/DFARS apply.

CPT is a registered trademark of the American Medical Association.

Codes used to identify services associated with this policy may include (but may not be limited to) the following:

Code Type	Code
CPT	0089U, 0090U, 0314U, 81345, 81401, 81479, 81529, 81599, 84999 Codes added effective 07/01/2023: 0315U, 0387U
HCPCS	No codes
ICD-10 Diagnosis	All related Diagnoses

*Investigational – A medical treatment, procedure, drug, device, or biological product is Investigational if the effectiveness has not been clearly tested and it has not been incorporated into standard medical practice. Any determination we make that a medical treatment, procedure, drug, device, or biological product is Investigational will be based on a consideration of the following:

A. Whether the medical treatment, procedure, drug, device, or biological product can be lawfully marketed without approval of the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) and

whether such approval has been granted at the time the medical treatment, procedure, drug, device, or biological product is sought to be furnished; or

B. Whether the medical treatment, procedure, drug, device, or biological product requires further studies or clinical trials to determine its maximum tolerated dose, toxicity, safety, effectiveness, or effectiveness as compared with the standard means of treatment or diagnosis, must improve health outcomes, according to the consensus of opinion among experts as shown by reliable evidence, including:
    1. Consultation with technology evaluation center(s);
    2. Credible scientific evidence published in peer-reviewed medical literature generally recognized by the relevant medical community; or
    3. Reference to federal regulations.

**Medically Necessary (or "Medical Necessity") - Health care services, treatment, procedures, equipment, drugs, devices, items or supplies that a Provider, exercising prudent clinical judgment, would provide to a patient for the purpose of preventing, evaluating, diagnosing or treating an illness, injury, disease or its symptoms, and that are:

A. In accordance with nationally accepted standards of medical practice;
B. Clinically appropriate, in terms of type, frequency, extent, level of care, site and duration, and considered effective for the patient's illness, injury or disease; and
C. Not primarily for the personal comfort or convenience of the patient, physician or other health care provider, and not more costly than an alternative service or sequence of services at least as likely to produce equivalent therapeutic or diagnostic results as to the diagnosis or treatment of that patient's illness, injury or disease.

For these purposes, "nationally accepted standards of medical practice" means standards that are based on credible scientific evidence published in peer-reviewed medical literature generally recognized by the relevant medical community, Physician Specialty Society recommendations and the views of Physicians practicing in relevant clinical areas and any other relevant factors.

‡ Indicated trademarks are the registered trademarks of their respective owners.

NOTICE: If the Patient's health insurance contract contains language that differs from the BCBSLA Medical Policy definition noted above, the definition in the health insurance contract will be relied upon for specific coverage determinations.

Gene Expression Profiling for Skin Cancer

Policy # 00622
Original Effective Date: 08/15/2018
Current Effective Date: 12/11/2023

NOTICE: Medical Policies are scientific based opinions, provided solely for coverage and informational purposes. Medical Policies should not be construed to suggest that the Company recommends, advocates, requires, encourages, or discourages any particular treatment, procedure, or service, or any particular course of treatment, procedure, or service.

NOTICE: Federal and State law, as well as contract language, including definitions and specific contract provisions/exclusions, take precedence over Medical Policy and must be considered first in determining eligibility for coverage.